2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

TO THE CLERK OF THE ABOVE-ENTITLED COURT:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendant Safeway Inc. ("Defendant") hereby removes to this Court the state court action described below. No other defendant has been named in this action.

- 1. On March 11, 2019, an action was commenced in the Superior Court of the State of California, in and for the County of Alameda ("State Court"), entitled, Debra Horn v. Safeway <u>Inc.</u>, et al., as Case No. RG19010397 (the "Action"). (A true and correct copy of the original complaint is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.)
- 2. Plaintiff Debra Horn ("Plaintiff") effected service of the Summons and Complaint on Defendant on April 8, 2019. (A true and correct copy of the Summons is attached hereto as **Exhibit B.**) Defendant is filing its Notice of Removal within 30 days of service of the Complaint.
- 3. This action is a civil action of which this Court has original jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and is one which may be removed to this Court by Defendant pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1441(c) in that it involves claims arising under federal law. Specifically, Plaintiff's Complaint alleges claims for (1) disability discrimination in violation of Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq. ("ADA"), (2) failure to accommodate in violation of the ADA, (3) harassment in violation of the ADA, and (4) retaliation in violation of the ADA.
- 4. In addition, Plaintiff's state claims are transactionally related to her federal claims. Plaintiff alleges state claims for (1) violation of California Labor Code § 1102.5, (2) retaliation in violation of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"), (3) harassment in violation of the FEHA, (4) aiding, abetting, inciting, compelling, or coercing harassment in violation of the FEHA, (5) disability discrimination in violation of the FEHA, (6) failure to prevent discrimination in violation of the FEHA, (7) failure to accommodate in violation of the FEHA and (8) failure to engage in the interactive process in violation of the FEHA. Plaintiff asserts the same allegations in support of both her federal and state claims. The Court, therefore has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(a).

PROOF OF SERVICE

I am employed in the City of Oakland, California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 1300 Clay Street, Suite 810, Oakland, California, 94612.

On May 8, 2019, I served the document named below on the parties in this action as follows:

NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) (FEDERAL QUESTION)

- X (BY MAIL) I caused each and such envelope, with postage thereon fully prepaid, to be placed in the United States mail at Oakland, California. I am readily familiar with the practice for the collection and processing of correspondence for mailing, said practice being that in the ordinary course of business, mail is deposited in the United States Postal Service the same day as it is placed for collection.
 - (BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I caused to be personally served each document listed above on the addressee (s) noted below.
 - _ (BY FACSIMILE) I caused to be sent via facsimile at the facsimile number listed below, a copy of each document to the addressee(s) noted below
 - (BY OVERNIGHT MAIL) I caused to be delivered to an overnight courier service each such envelope to the addressee noted below.

Dan Siegel, Esq. Micah Clatterbaugh, Esq. Siegel, Yee, Brunner & Mehta 475 14th Street, Suite 500 Oakland, CA 94612

Attorneys for Plaintiff

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on *May 8, 2019,* at Oakland, CA

DENISE TAYLOR

EXHIBIT A

Mar.	11. 2019 11:16AM siegel & yee	No. 3578 F. 4	4 .
	·		
		FILED BY FAX	
1	DAN SIEGEL, SBN 56400	ALAMEDA COUN	
2	MICAH CLATTERBAUGH, SBN 316808 SIEGEL, YEE, BRUNNER & MEHTA	March 11, 2019	
	475 14th Street, Suite 500	CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR O By Milagros Cortez	COURT
3	Oakland, California 94612 Telephone: (510) 839-1200	CASE NUMBER:	
4	Facsimile: (510) 444-6698	RG19010397	
5	dansiegel@siegelyee.com		
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
7	DEBRA HORN		
8			
9	SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
11		·	
12	DEBRA HORN	Case No.	
13	Plaintiff,	VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES	
	vs.	AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	
14		{	
15	SAFEWAY INC., and Does 1-50, Defendants.	Demand for Jury Trial	
16	Defendants.	}	
17			
18	Plaintiff DEBRA HORN complains against defendants SAFEWAY INC., and Does		
19	1-50 as follows:		
20	PRELIMINARY STATEMENT		
21	1. DEBRA HORN ("Ms. Horn") brings this action against defendant SAFEWAY		
22	INC. ("Safeway") for discrimination based on disability, failure to prevent		
23	discrimination, failure to accommodate disability, failure to enter into the interactive		
24	process to determine reasonable accommodation, retaliation, and harassment. Ms.		
25	Horn was a hard-working employee for approximately 14 years. She suffered workplace		
26	injuries to her foot, knees, and hand, requiring multiple surgeries and reasonable		
20 27	accommodation. Safeway routinely refused to provide reasonable accommodation or		
28		-	
20	Yearn v. Coference Year Const. No.		
	Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No Complaint – 1		

enter into the interactive process to determine reasonable accommodation. When Horn

disability and encouraged, condoned, or failed to prevent her coworkers from doing the

insisted on reasonable accommodation, her supervisors harassed her based on her

same. When Horn insisted on reasonable accommodation in 2016 and 2017, her

supervisors retaliated against her through unfounded discipline, including written

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

warnings, a three-day suspension, indefinite suspension, and termination.

2. Plaintiff's claims arise under the statutory law of the State of California.

3. The actions giving rise to this lawsuit occurred in the County of Alameda.

PARTIES

- 4. Plaintiff DEBRA HORN was an employee of defendant SAFEWAY INC. at its Dublin, California store at all times relevant to this controversy.
- 5. At all times relevant to this controversy, defendant SAFEWAY INC. was a corporation operating grocery stores and was HORN's employer.
- 6. Plaintiff is unaware of the true names and capacities of the defendants sued herein as DOES 1-50 and therefore sues said defendants by such fictitious names.

 Plaintiff will amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when they become known to plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1-50 are agents of Safeway Inc., acted in concert with it, and are liable for some or all of the damages suffered by plaintiff. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that DOES 1-50 are residents of the State of California. Plaintiff will hereafter refer to all defendants jointly as "Safeway."

STATEMENT OF FACTS

- 7. Safeway hired Ms. Horn as a clerk in 2003. She stocked product shelves, cashiered, assisted with self-checkout, and performed general customer service.
 - 8. In 2005 Ms. Horn suffered injuries to her left foot while performing her job

Horn v. Safeway Inc., (Case No
Complaint – 2	

 duties at Safeway. She had several surgeries to her foot to address these injuries in 2005, 2006, and 2007.

- 9. Ms. Horn's foot injuries caused her increasing pain which occurred within an hour of standing at Safeway's check-out stand. This condition continued thereafter.
- 10. In December 2006 Ms. Horn's doctor recommended that Safeway either provide her with a stool at her work station or restrict her work to activities that would not require her to stand for long periods.
- 11. On February 16, 2007, Ms. Horn's doctor issued a work status report placing Ms. Horn on modified duty with a permanent restriction limiting standing to four hours per eight hour shift.
- 12. When Ms. Horn returned to work shortly thereafter, Store Manager Brian Sullivan frequently assigned her to check-out for more than four hours in a shift.
- 13. Also in 2007, Safeway failed to discuss with Ms. Horn possible ways to accommodate the restrictions Ms. Horn's doctor placed on her work in 2007. It did not provide a stool at her work station.
- 14. In 2009 Ms. Horn's doctor recommended she not work check-out standing in a confined space for more than two hours at any one time or for more than four hours per day.
- 15. Also in 2009, Ms. Horn presented Sullivan with the accommodations recommended by her doctors, per Sullivan's request. Sullivan threw it in her face and told her to do as she was told or get another job.
- 16. In or around 2009, Michael Vasquez became Assistant Store Manager at Safeway. He frequently assigned Ms. Horn to check-out for more than four hours in a shift.
- 17. On or about July 8, 2010, Ms. Horn reported to Safeway that she was experiencing persistent pain in her left hand associated with work. Safeway refused to allow her to file an accident report and instructed her to wait to see if it went away.

- 18. On or about November 12, 2010, Safeway finally allowed Ms. Horn to file an accident report regarding her left hand. She had spent the previous four months in intense pain in her left hand.
- 19. Ms. Horn's left hand required multiple surgeries, which she received in 2012. Her doctor recommended that she perform work that did not require repetitive motion. Safeway ignored this recommendation and continued to assign Ms. Horn to check-out.
- 20. In 2012, on the recommendation of her doctor, Ms. Horn asserted her rights as a disabled employee through a letter from her attorney. Safeway continued its failure to reasonably accommodate her disability, continued to refuse to engage in the interactive process to determine reasonable accommodation, continued to harass her on the basis of her disability, and continued to allow its employees to do the same.
- 21. In 2013, Ms. Horn's doctor recommended that she not perform work at a check-out stand for more than two hours per day. Safeway refused.
- 22. In 2014, Ms. Horn complained to Safeway that it was discriminating against her on the basis of her disability, that it was failing to reasonably accommodate her disability, and that coworkers were harassing her by making negative comments about her disability—at times in front of customers—and suggesting that her disability or need for accommodation was insincere. Safeway ignored Ms. Horn's complaints and took no action.
- 23. In October 2016, Ms. Horn complained again to Safeway that it was discriminating against her on the basis of her disability, that it was failing to reasonably accommodate her disability, that coworkers were harassing her by making negative comments about her disability—at times in front of customers—and suggesting that her disability or need for accommodation was insincere, and that Safeway violated her rights to have her medical history and health information maintained confidential. Safeway ignored Ms. Horn's complaints and took no action.

- 24. From 2009 through 2016 Safeway routinely assigned Ms. Horn to work at a check-out stand for more than two hours at a time and for more than four hours per day, without access to a stool or other means to perform check-out duties without standing.
- 25. In 2016 Ms. Horn repeatedly insisted that Safeway provide accommodations consistent with her doctors' recommendations. Store Manager Michael Vasquez flatly refused and told her to get another job. Vasquez refused to enter into discussions exploring options for accommodation.
- 26. On or about November 14, 2016, Vasquez issued a written warning to Horn, accusing her of poor customer service. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this written warning was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.
- 27. On or about November 23, 2016, Vasquez issued a three-day suspension without pay to Horn, again accusing her of poor customer service. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this suspension was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.
- 28. On November 24, 2016, Ms. Horn slipped and fell while on the job, injuring her knees. Ms. Horn repeatedly requested assistance from Safeway in getting treatment for this on-the-job injury. Safeway provided no assistance.
- 29. On or about December 3, 2016, Ms. Horn's doctor recommended performing repetitive motion with either hand for no more than 25 percent of the shift; lifting, carrying, pushing or pulling no more than ten pounds; no climbing; no pivoting; no squatting; no stooping; no crawling; and no standing or walking for more than ten minutes per hour. Safeway again refused to provide reasonable accommodations consistent with these medical recommendations. Safeway again refused to discuss possible ways to provide reasonable accommodation of Ms. Horn's disability.
- 30. On or about March 1, 2017, Ms. Horn submitted a vacation request form to Vasquez. Vasquez refused to approve Ms. Horn's vacation request according to the

Horn v. Safeway Inc.,	Case No.
Complaint – 5	

 collective bargaining agreement. When Ms. Horn protested, he said to file a grievance. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this refusal was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.

- 31. On or about March 16, 2017, Safeway denied Ms. Horn's request for funeral leave to attend her grandmother's wake and funeral. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this denial was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.
- 32. On March 25, 2017, Ms. Horn's coworker, Cindy Cornejo, told her to call the police on a suspected shoplifter. Ms. Horn refused. Cornejo dialed 911 on her own phone, handed it to Ms. Horn, and began following the customer Cornejo suspected of shoplifting. The customer later came to Ms. Horn's self check-out and asked for the manager. Ms. Horn called the Person In Charge, Zaine Caddell.
- 33. On April 26, 2017, Safeway suspended Ms. Horn indefinitely. Safeway refused to provide an explanation. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this suspension was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.
- 34. On April 28, 2017, Ms. Horn submitted to Vasquez a request for medical coverage while on leave. Vasquez refused to approve it. Ms. Horn reasonably believes this refusal was in retaliation for her assertion of her rights as a disabled employee.
- 35. On June 29, 2017, Safeway District Manager Kevin Lovell issued a letter to Horn terminating her employment, accusing her of violation of company policy or procedures.
- 36. Safeway has subsequently informed Ms. Horn that the alleged violation of policy was regarding a policy for handling suspected shoplifters. Ms. Horn denies violation of any such policy or procedure.
- 37. On February 10, 2019, Safeway reduced Ms. Horn's termination to a oneyear suspension through binding arbitration pursuant to her collective bargaining agreement.
 - 38. Throughout Ms. Horn's employment by Safeway, there were assignments

available consistent with her doctor's recommendations which Safeway could have, but chose not to give to Ms. Horn. These include, but are not limited to, day stocker without checking duties, produce clerk, dairy clerk, liquor clerk, and general merchandise clerk.

EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

- 39. Ms. Horn exhausted administrative remedies by filing charges with the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) and the United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The California Department of Fair Employment and Housing issued a right to sue letter on May 16, 2017.
 - 40. The EEOC issued a right to sue letter to her on September 25, 2018.
- 41. On December 13, 2018, Safeway entered into a tolling agreement with Ms. Horn, tolling the statute of limitations for any and all claims between them until either thirty days after mediation through the EEOC (scheduled for April 11, 2019), or until written cancellation of the tolling agreement by either party, with 30 days' notice. Ms. Horn hereby cancels the tolling agreement, effective 30 days after service of this complaint on Safeway.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA LABOR CODE § 1102.5 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Cal. Lab. Code § 1102.5)

- 42. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-41 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 43. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and Does 1-50 retaliated against HORN for disclosing what she reasonably believed were violations of the law and because defendants SAFEWAY INC. and Does 1-50 suspected she would disclose violations of the law.

Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No. _____ Complaint – 7

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Retaliation)

- 44. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-43 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 45. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 retaliated against HORN because she complained about disability discrimination against her, because she complained about failure to reasonably accommodate disability, and because she complained about harassment based on disability or perceived disability.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Harassment)

- 46. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-45 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 47. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 harassed HORN on the basis of her disability or perceived disability, causing her to suffer a hostile work environment.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE § 12940 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Aiding, abetting, inciting, compelling, or coercing harassment)

- 48. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-47 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 49. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 aided, abetted, incited, compelled, or coerced others to harass HORN regarding her disability or perceived disability.

Horn v. Safeway Inc.,	Case No.
Complaint – 8	

to properly engage in the interactive process in determining reasonable accommodation 1 of HORN's disability or perceived disability. 2 NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF 3 VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, 4 42 U.S.C. 12101, et seq. (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) 5 -(Disability-Discrimination) 6 58. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-57 above as though fully set 7 forth herein. 8 59. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 9 discriminated against HORN on the basis of her disability or perceived disability. 10 TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT. 11 42 U.S.C. 12101, et seq. 12 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Failure to Accommodate) 13 60. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-59 above as though fully set 14 forth herein. 15 61. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 failed 16 to reasonably accommodate HORN's disability or perceived disability. 17 **ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF** 18 VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, 42 U.S.C. 12101, et seq. 19 (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) 20 (Harassment) 21 62. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-61 above as though fully set 22 forth herein. 23 63. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 24 harassed HORN regarding her disability or perceived disability, causing her to suffer a 25 hostile work environment. 26 27 28 Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No. Complaint - 10

TWELFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT, 42 U.S.C. 12101, et seq. (against defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50) (Retaliation)

- 64. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1-63 above as though fully set forth herein.
- 65. By virtue of the foregoing, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 retaliated against HORN because she complained about disability discrimination against her, because she complained about failure to reasonably accommodate disability, and because she complained about harassment based on disability or perceived disability.

DAMAGES

- 66. As a result of the actions of defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50, plaintiff has been injured and has suffered damages as follows:
- (a) She has lost compensation and other employment-related benefits to which she has been entitled and will lose such compensation and benefits in the future;
 - (b) She has suffered from physical pain and suffering;
- (c) She has suffered from emotional distress, embarrassment and humiliation, and has suffered damage to her professional reputation and standing; and
 - (d) She has incurred out-of-pocket expenses for health care benefits.

PUNITIVE DAMAGES

67. In taking the actions described above, defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 acted maliciously and oppressively, with a conscious disregard of HORN's rights and for the purpose of punishing her because she complained about disability discrimination against her, because she complained about failure to reasonably accommodate disability, and because she complained about harassment based on disability or perceived disability.

Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No	
Complaint – 11	

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests that this Court grant her relief as follows:

- (1) Injunctive relief to require defendants SAFEWAY INC. and DOES 1-50 to cease and desist from engaging in or allowing unlawful workplace harassment on the basis of disability or perceived disability;
- (2) Injunctive relief to require defendant SAFEWAY INC. to provide mandatory training to all supervisors it employs in the identification and prevention of workplace harassment based on disability, failure to reasonably accommodate disability in the workplace, and failure to engage in the interactive process in determining reasonable accommodation of disability or perceived disability in the workplace;
- (3) Injunctive relief to require defendant SAFEWAY INC. to publish a policy statement delineating employee rights and manager responsibilities with regard to employee complaints of harassment or discrimination on the basis of disability and to post that policy statement prominently in the workplace;
- (4) Compensatory damages for past and future lost wages and benefits, in an amount to be determined;
 - (5) Interest at the legal rate;
- (6) General damages for emotional distress and pain and suffering, in an amount to be determined;
 - (7) Special damages for out-of-pocket expenses;
 - (8) Punitive damages, in an amount to be determined;
 - (9) Attorneys' fees;
 - (10) Costs of suit; and
 - (11) Such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No. _____ Complaint – 12

	DEMA:	Lu demando o inmetriol
	Plaintiff DEBRA HORN here	by demands a jury trial.
	Dated: March 11, 2019	
		SIEGEL, YEE, BRUNNER & MEHTA
		Byz Minh Classical Control
		Micah Claiterbaugh
		Attorneys for Plaintiff DEBRA HORN
-		
		•

VERIFICATION I, DEBRA HORN, declare as follows: I am the plaintiff in this action. I have read the foregoing Verified Complaint for Injunctive Relief and Damages and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my personal knowledge except where stated on information and belief and, as to such matters, I believe it to be true. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 8, 2019, at ___ ____, California. Horn v. Safeway Inc., Case No.

Complaint - 14

EXHIBIT B

Mar. 11. 2019 11:16AM

siegel & vee

No. 3578 F. 3

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): Safeway Inc., and Does 1-50

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF:

(LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE):

Debra Hom

SUM-100

FOR COURT USE DNLY (\$0L0 PARA USD DE LA CORYE)

FILED BY FAX ALAMEDA COUNTY

March 11, 2019

CLERK OF

THE SUPERIOR COURT

NOTICE! You have been sued. The court may decide against you without your being heard unless you respond within 30 days. Read the information below. You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy

served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response, You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfnelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clerk for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements. You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an altorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program. You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site/www.lewhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county bar association.NOTE: The court has a statutory lien for waived fees and costs on any settlement or arbitration award of \$10,000 or more in a civil case. The count's lien must be paid before the count will dismiss the case. ¡AVISOI Lo han demandado. Si no responde dentro de 30 días, la corte puede decidir en su contra sin escuchar su versión. Lea la información a continuación

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presenter una respuesta por escrito en esta corte y hacer que se entregue una copia al demandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que estar en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrer estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de Californiquem, sucorte ca gov), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quede más cerca. Si no puede pager la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presente su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoca a un abogado, puede llamar a un servicio de remisión e abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin fines de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin fines de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California,(www.sucorte.ca.gov) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales. AVISO: Por ley, la corte tiene derecho a reclamar las cuotas y los costos exentos por imponer un gravamen sobre

cualquier recuperación de \$10,000 6 n pagar el gravamen de la corta antes d	nas de valor recibida mediante un acuei e que la corte pueda desechar el caso.	rdo o una concesión de arbitraj	e en un caso de derecho civil. Tiene qu	∪ė
The name and address of the court (El nombre y dirección de la corte e		CASE N (Namer	UNIBÉR o del Caso);	
Superior Court of California, C 1225 Fallon Street Oakland, CA 94612 The name, address, and telephone	•	iniff without on alloway in	RG19010397	
(El nombre, la dirección y el número Dan Siegel, SBN 56400 Micah Siegel, Yee, Brunner & Mehta (475 14th Swaes #580; Paklacci	o de teléfono del abogado del demai Clatterbaugh, SBN 316080 (510) 839-1200	ndante, o del demandante q	ue no tiene abogado, es):	
DATE: March 11, 2019 (Fecha)		Clerk, by (Secretario) ————————————————————————————————————	, De	puty junto,
(For proof of service of this summon (Pa) cite (Pa) cite (Pa) (Pa) (Pa) (Pa) (Pa) (Pa) (Pa) (Pa)	orión use el formulario Proof of Sen OTICE TO THE PERSON SERVED as en individual defendant. as the person sued under the on behalf of (specify): under: CCP 416.10 (corp	vice of Summons, (POS-010: You are served a fictilious name of (specify) oration)))).	

Form Adopted for Mandgiory Use Judicial Council of California SLM-100 (Rev. July 1, 2008)

CEB Essential

SUMMONS

by personal delivery on (date):

Fage 1 of 1 Code of Civil Procedure §§ 412.20, 465

Horn, Debra